

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. No claims have been amended herein. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-23, and 25-27 are pending and are in condition for allowance.

### **Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-7, 13-20 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0110468 in view of Ellis, U.S. Publication No. 2008/1084327. Applicant respectfully traverses said rejection for the following reasons.

In Applicant's previous Amendment and Response, filed Jan. 21, 2009, Applicant amended independent claim 1 to additionally claim, a wireless signal receiver, comprising a singular wireless interface which is operational with a wireless networking card and a computing device. Similarly, Applicant amended independent claim 16 to additionally claim, providing said consumer with a wireless signal receiver, comprising a singular wireless interface that is operational with a wireless networking card and a computing device... Likewise, Applicant amended independent claim 22 to additionally claim, a first wireless interface, which is operational with a wireless networking card and a computing device. In the corresponding Remarks section, filed with the Jan. 21<sup>st</sup> Response, Applicant pointed out that, "The prior art of record, neither singly nor in any combination, discloses a single wireless interface which is operational with both a wireless networking card and a computing device. This provides a clear advantage of requiring just one wireless interface instead of multiple wireless interfaces.

Therefore, remote computer controls, such as a wireless keyboard, a wireless mouse, or a wireless camera could be used with no additional wireless interface required.”

The Office responded to Applicant’s filed response of Jan. 21<sup>st</sup> in the “Response to Arguments” section, stating that, “The Examiner is unsure if applicant intended the amendment to utilize a wireless interface which is operational with both a wireless networking card and a computing peripheral based on the later claims directed to wireless mice etc.” The formal rejection repeated a 35 USC 103 rejection made in the prior Office Action, mailed Oct. 21, 2008.

The previously amended claim feature is drawn to a **singular** wireless interface, (i.e. single, solo, not more than one) which is operational with a wireless networking card **and** a computing device. Stated another way, this *single* wireless interface is operational with *both* a wireless card *and* a computing device. This claimed feature is clear, simple, and direct. Applicant further pointed out this concept under the Remarks section. In addition, Applicant previously made the further statement that, “This provides a clear advantage of requiring *just one wireless interface* instead of multiple wireless interfaces.” Again under the Remarks section, Applicant previously stated that, “Therefore, remote computer controls, such as a wireless keyboard, a wireless mouse, or a wireless camera could be used *with no additional wireless interface required.*”

The Office also cited Perlman paragraph 59 to substantiate its rejection. In paragraph 59, Perlman describes a WLAN comprising a tuner with a connection to a video/data source, such as cable television. The tuner sends the content to one or more wireless destination devices. At the end of paragraph 59, Perlman states that, “In this example, PDA and laptop computer are **each** configured with wireless transceiver **cards** for receiving and transmitting data

across the wireless network.” Stated another way, there are *two separate cards for the two devices*. Therefore, Perlman does not disclose the claimed features of independent claims 1, 16, or 22. Ellis does not compensate for the deficiencies of Perlman.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 16, and 22 are allowable over the prior art of record, as are dependent claims 2-7, 13-15, 17-20, and 23, for at least the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 13-20 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0110468 in view of Ellis, U.S. Publication No. 2008/1084327.

Claims 9-11, 21 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman in view of Ellis in further view of Parker et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0234804. As discussed above, independent claims 1, 16, and 22 are allowable over the prior art of record of Perlman and Ellis. Parker does not compensate for the deficiencies of Perlman and Ellis. Therefore, dependent claims 9-11, 21, and 25-27 are also allowable over the prior art of record, at least for the same reasons in regard to claims 1, 16, and 22. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-11, 21 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perlman in view of Ellis in further view of Parker et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0234804.

Since the Office Action of Feb. 4, 2009 was improper, Applicant expects either a Notice of Allowance, or a proper nonfinal Office Action to be forthcoming from this instant Response. Applicant was very clear as to the intention and meaning of the amended features

discussed above. The claim amendments, combined with Applicant's Remarks, should have left no doubt as to what was being claimed.

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-23, and 25-27 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 202-783-8400 or [nberezny@shb.com](mailto:nberezny@shb.com) (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

/NEMA BEREZNY/

Nema Berezny  
Reg. No. 57,706

NOB/bp  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613  
816-474-6550